

CLIL in Italian Universities: Lessons for Japan

Kate ELWOOD

Introduction

As in many other countries in the world, the curricula of Japanese universities are undergoing an important transformation based on a partial shift in language of instruction. In 2012, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology specified the need for universities to provide courses in English to allow Japanese students to attain the English skills necessary in the context of globalization and to enable foreign students to study in Japan easily (MEXT, 2012). The Ministry further indicated a goal of 300,000 international students studying in Japan by 2020 (MEXT, 2012). In response, more and more universities in Japan are increasing the number of courses taught in English. Waseda University, for example, has announced its aim to increase the percentage of undergraduate and graduate courses taught in English and other foreign languages to 50% by 2032, up from 9% and 6% respectively in 2012 (Waseda University, 2012).

Raising the percentage of courses taught in foreign languages to such a significant degree necessarily involves substantial planning. Moreover, the targeting of two types of students, domestic and international, for the courses adds to the difficulties, as the needs of these students are likely to vary considerably. Furthermore, if the objective of student attainment of English competence (or that of another foreign language) through content courses is

genuinely shouldered, simple transplants of courses offered in countries where the target language is dominant will not suffice.

At present, most of the students taking content courses in English in Japan are Japanese (Brown, 2017). For many of these students, the challenges of coping with difficult content in English are considerable. Despite this, there is a lack of appropriate educational resources and teacher support to cope with the needs of such students, who often face a "sink or swim" attitude (Kane, Tanaka, and Kobayashi, 2014). Accordingly, implementation of these educational reforms requires careful deliberation of a range of pedagogical matters including methodology, training, and materials development.

The CLIL (Content and Language in Integrated Learning) methodology developed largely in response to the European Commission's promotion of an aim that all students in EU countries would become proficient in three EU languages. While the EU context and that of Japan have clear differences, the central issues of how to prepare teachers to teach in a language that may not be either their own native language or that of the students, and how to ensure that mastery of both the content and the language is attained by the students, run parallel. This paper will provide an overview of CLIL and then report on the experiences of putting CLIL into practice at five Italian universities, based on face-to-face interviews with professors involved in CLIL implementation at the tertiary level, with an aim to shed light on some ways Japan may also fulfill the goal of increasing tertiary-level English instruction in content courses.

Background of CLIL

Multilingual education has been an EU goal for more than 30 years. The European Commission's White Paper on Education and Learning (1995) specified the necessity of knowledge of three European Community languages as its Fourth General Objective, identifying as benefits the ability to work in various countries in the European Community, the possibility to build personal and professional relationships, and enhancement of a feeling of being

European (European Commission, 1995, p.47).

As a result, CLIL gradually emerged, beginning in the mid-1990s, first in primary and secondary education and later expanding to tertiary education, across a range of European countries and contexts as researchers began sharing the results of CLIL initiatives. CLIL is essentially an umbrella term for a variety of practices that integrate content and language (Bosisio, 2015). In Italy, CLIL has also been used to enhance learning of minority languages (Ludbrook, 2008). One advantage of CLIL is its two-birds-with-one-stone approach because content courses that are already part of the curriculum are taught in English; it does not entail adding extra language courses to the curriculum or lengthening instruction time in order to achieve the three-language proficiency objective (European Commission, 2014, p.3). In 2014, at least 12 EU countries were using CLIL, and it was believed likely to enhance students' foreign language abilities (European Commission, 2014, p.1).

CLIL and CBI

Content-Based Instruction (CBI), an earlier model of language and content instruction that developed in the 1980s, is often compared to CLIL, and indeed used interchangeably by some researchers (Brown and Bradford, 2017). Cenoz (2015) argues that there are no “essential” differences between CLIL and CBI although there are “accidental” differences based on the educational context (Cenoz, 2015, pp.21-22). The essential properties in common include the medium of instruction, language aims, and societal/educational aims. Accidental differences, Cenoz contends, are conventions related to *which* language is the language of instruction, with English, French, or German more likely to receive the CLIL designation, and whether the teacher is a native or non-native speaker of the target language: non-native teachers are often associated with CLIL (Cenoz, 2015).

However, other researchers observe an important difference in CBI and CLIL based on whether the instruction is language-driven or content-driven. Brown and Bradford (2017) point out that language goals typically take prece-

dence in CBI with the content a conduit for language learning. On the other hand, in CLIL, the content determines the language that will be learned (Wolff, 2007). Moreover, CLIL specifically seeks to teach content courses which would normally be taught in the LI curriculum, with clearly defined content-learning outcomes (Brown and Bradford, 2017). Certainly there is considerable overlap between CBI and CLIL in methodology. However, as specific needs changed to replicating existing content courses in a foreign target language, while firmly adhering to language-learning outcomes as well as mastery of content, CLIL has taken center stage. As a result, the term CLIL has been used more than CBI in Europe for more than 20 years (Bosio, 2015).

CLIL in practice

Implementation of CLIL requires deliberation regarding the most appropriate CLIL model, the educational materials, use of the L1, as well as the method of assessment. A brief overview of important elements and considerations in each of these areas follows. Problems and criticisms of CLIL are also addressed.

Models of CLIL

Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010) describe three models of CLIL at the tertiary level. In the first model, “plurilingual education”, students take various courses in different languages, typically after having attained a certain level of proficiency in the language of instruction. In “adjunct CLIL”, students take language courses that run parallel to the content courses and are designed to specifically prepare students to cope with the linguistic demands of the content course. Finally, the “language-embedded” model indicates that students simultaneously study the language and content, with language teachers forming an integral part of the course along with content teachers (Coyle et. al, 2010).

Coyle et. al (2010) note that the plurilingual education model is only feasi-

ble when students are at a high level of competency in the target language and suggest that the other two models, adjunct CLIL and language-embedded CLIL, are more prevalent. Nevertheless, these models entail close cooperation between content teachers and language teachers, which is not always easy to facilitate, and, in the case of adjunct CLIL, unless these language courses take the place of existing language courses, the benefit of adding a further language component without increasing the number of courses in the curriculum vanishes. Cinganotto (2016) points out that although the Italian Ministry of Education specified the creation of a content and language teacher partnership dubbed “Team CLIL” as part of the transition from native-language to target-language courses at the secondary level in 2013 and 2014, implementation has been difficult.

Adjunct CLIL may be realized in a variety of ways. Coonan (2012) points to four scenarios of adjunct CLIL, two preparatory, in which language learning to support the CLIL course takes place either before the start of the whole course or before each CLIL lesson, and two concurrent. In the first preparatory scenario, language related to the content to be taught in the CLIL classroom can be identified and added to language classes. The secondary preparatory scenario goes one step further: actual content is taught in the language classes in advance of the content courses. In one concurrent scenario, as language problems arise while teaching a CLIL course, these are dealt with in the language classes, allowing for more precise tweaking. Finally, an actual CLIL module may be taught in a language class (Coonan, 2012).

This last scenario is sometimes referred to as “weak CLIL”. However, CLIL in a language class may not fulfill the objectives of CLIL, as such an approach may fail to increase the number of hours in the curriculum in which students are immersed in the foreign language. In addition, such courses run the risk of being language-driven rather than determined by content (Coonan, 2003).

One final model might be termed “gradual CLIL”. Ludbrook (2008) notes

that in some secondary schools, the amount of English used is gradually increased during the course. Such an approach may allow students to achieve a basic grounding in content before adding on the additional burden of the foreign language. In such a scenario, how to phase in the L2 (and phase out the L1) would likely be an important determinant of its success.

Educational materials

The lack of appropriate educational materials is often cited as a significant hurdle in introducing CLIL courses. Content level must be maintained, but linguistic challenges cannot be ignored. In selecting texts for CLIL, Coyle et. al (2010) list the following points of evaluation:

- ✓ The focus of the message (is it the content you want?)
- ✓ The clarity of the message
- ✓ The mix of textual styles for presentation
- ✓ The level of subject-specific specialist vocabulary
- ✓ The level of general vocabulary
- ✓ The level of grammatical/syntactical complexity
- ✓ The clarity of the thread of thinking

(Coyle et. al, 2010, p.93)

Adapting authentic materials to meet these specifications is often an onerous burden for the CLIL teacher. While publishers have begun issuing some textbooks with CLIL content, these may not sufficiently serve the needs of the CLIL classroom. Banegas (2014) examined four secondary-level textbooks issued by four major publishers in the U.K. and sold in Argentina that included CLIL components. He found that the contents did not follow the Argentinian L1 curriculum sufficiently, were oversimplified, and generally did not require learners to remember, summarize, or analyze the contents (Banegas, 2014).

Even if authentic materials of a suitable level are available, they may cover content that is not appropriate for the needs of the learners of a spe-

cific region or country. Chung (2015) similarly notes the difficulty of finding suitable CLIL materials for courses at the People's Police University in Vietnam because of differences in law enforcement practices in the countries of publication and the local context. Such a problem is likely to occur in any field that is founded on local regulations and practice. While noticing differences between the materials and the local situation may occasionally serve as an interesting analytical task, the danger of confusing students is possible.

Yet another problem – one that potentially exists in all classrooms but is particularly salient in CLIL courses – is differences in student abilities. Hondris, Vlhavas, and Demtriadis (2007) point out that when using authentic materials it can be difficult for the teacher to decide how much language support is needed in a class with students of varied linguistic abilities. The teacher may further be frustrated by the amount of class time spent on language issues. Hondris et al (2007) propose the use of embedding explanations and hyperlinks in digital materials, and enabling students to include comments on the language support in an ongoing process of materials enhancement. In this way, over several semesters the materials will be refined. However, this approach requires technical skill as well as a large commitment of time.

The use of authentic materials is a cornerstone of CLIL, but actual attempts at implementation of teaching with these materials are often daunting. Leonardi (2009) notes that the difficulties of finding suitable authentic materials may lead some teachers to propose using non-authentic materials, but she asserts that authentic materials are a “fundamental language tool able to balance real-language with real-content situations” (Leonardi, 2009, p.193). She proposes that teachers make the authentic materials accessible to students through repetition, paraphrases, simplifications, translations (in a contrastive context), definitions, synonyms, body language, and use of L1 (Leonardi, 2009). Consideration of issues related to educational materials makes plain the challenges of the CLIL classroom. Finding materials that cover the needs of the course and ensuring that students are able to compre-

hend them sufficiently is a more complicated matter than in the traditional content or language course.

Use of the L1: Translanguaging

Translanguaging refers to the strategic use of the L1 in a CLIL class. Moore and Nikula (2016) note that the CLIL focus on achieving proficiency in the L2 has led to a lack of attention on the potential roles of the L1. Certainly, while the emphasis in CLIL is on learning content through language, some research indicates that the L1 has its own role to play in the CLIL classroom. Gallagher and Colohan (2014) found that the L1 can effectively highlight language differences. They conducted a student dictation in a northern Italian geography class in two ways. One group of students heard sentences in English related to climate, decided whether the sentences related to tropical rainforests or hot deserts, and wrote the sentences in the appropriate column in English. A second group of students did the same dictation but were instructed to write the sentences in the appropriate columns in Italian. A follow-up questionnaire to both groups of students revealed that students in the translation group commented more frequently on noticing language differences between English and Italian, particularly placement of adverbs of frequency and place (Gallagher and Colohan, 2014).

Translanguaging may also serve a “lubricating role” (Lanabaster, 2017, p.265). Lanagabaster (2017) interviewed teachers in three secondary schools in the Basque Autonomous Community in Spain and found that the L1 was primarily used to help students understand, to point out differences in the L1 and L2, and to deal with disciplinary issues. Such use of the L1 to facilitate instruction may contribute to rather than detract from CLIL objectives.

The L1 may serve other roles as well, depending on the participants. Moore and Nikula (2016) examined instances of translanguaging in CLIL classes in six academic subjects in secondary schools in Finland, Spain, and Austria. They observed that when teachers are non-native speakers and some students in the class are native speakers, they may ask language ques-

tions of the students, acknowledging students' linguistic expertise. Similar to other researchers, they found that teachers may make use of the L1 to draw a distinction between a word which has a general meaning and a specific academic meaning. Students further use the L1 to confirm instructions. Finally, they note that teachers often use L1 discourse markers. They conclude that "translanguaging in CLIL is purposeful" (Moore and Nikula, 2016, p.232).

Assessment

CLIL places focus on content, yet it also includes language outcomes. Therefore, assessment requires evaluation of both the students' knowledge of the content as well as the language covered in a course. These can be assessed in tandem or separately. Table 1 shows a breakdown of assessment according to language and content, proposed by Serragiotto (2007).

Table 1. Example of assessment breakdown

Language	Content
Spelling	Quality of ideas
Grammar	Adequacy of examples
Lexicon/Vocabulary	Originality
Organization	Bibliographic documentation

(Seragiotto, 2007, p.272)

One concern is that language shortcomings will hinder a student from displaying knowledge of content. Llinares, Morton, and Whittaker (2012) strongly urge the use of multiple assessment tools:

"Widening the range of assessment procedures will allow language learners to show their content knowledge and skills in different ways. If CLIL teachers have at their disposal a broad repertoire of assessment techniques, they will be better placed to avoid those in which language issues may unnecessarily interfere with students' demonstrations of content knowledge and skills. They can choose assessment methods in which they are more able to control the ways in which students use language in carrying them out. One way

of doing this is to vary the modes in which students present information, for example, by using tables, diagrams and other graphic organisers. Language will then not be the only means of demonstrating knowledge or skill, and its role in any assessment task can be more clearly specified. Reliance on one type of assessment, such as essays, while already questionable from a content-learning perspective, will be doubly so from a CLIL perspective as it may place linguistics barriers on students' demonstration of learning." (Llinares et. al, 2012, 307-308)

The goal is not to make the need for language proficiency negligible but rather to create a range of assessment tools so that the types of language that need to be assessed are in fact properly assessed and that students are also able to demonstrate knowledge of content sufficiently.

How to assess language appropriately becomes an even more significant issue in courses outside the humanities. Hofmannová, Novotná, and Pípalová (2008), in discussing assessment in a CLIL mathematics course, point out the importance of oral testing in addition to written testing in CLIL, which produces a greater range of language output as well as enabling negotiation of meaning between the teacher and the student, noting that in written tests, the students' linguistic ability "is more or less presupposed rather than actively demonstrated and tested" (Hofmannová et. al, 2008, p.30). While in the written task all that is necessary is that the student understand the instructions, in the oral task they must also produce the language of the answer. They give the following example:

Problem

An amphitheatre has a circular plan with a diameter of 50m. The maximum width of the stage is 25m. What is the visual angle whereby the spectators at the circumference can see the stage?

- A. All of them see it under the visual angle 30° .
- B. All of them see it under the visual angle 45° .
- C. All of them see it under the visual angle 60° .
- D. All of them see it under the visual angle 90° .

E. The visual angle depends on the spectator's position.

Hofmannová et al (2008) point out that in order to solve the problem, little language is required. They identified the needed language as follows:

Specific mathematical vocabulary

English; circular; plan; diameter; visual angle; circumference

General vocabulary

Ampitheatre; width; stage; degree; position; spectator

Grammar

Prepositions: with, of, whereby, under; Possessive case: spectator's position

In contrast, an oral response might yield a wealth of additional language:

Specific mathematical vocabulary

Radius; points; triangle; interior angle; exterior angle; equilateral; isosceles; base; angle at the circumference; angle at the center; half-plane; angle bisector; perpendicular; erect a perpendicular; supplementary angles; arc

General vocabulary

Center; label; represent; half

Structure

Let S be the centre; - it follows that ...; - ... is equal to; - angles are subtended; - therefore ...

(Hofmannová et. al, 2008, pp.26-27)

In this way, if the objective of nurturing students' ability to discuss the discipline in the foreign language is taken up fully, traditional methods of assessment will likely need to be modified or augmented.

Problems / criticism of CLIL

CLIL makes new demands of content teachers, and it may additionally increase demands on language teachers when they are involved in the courses. In some countries, teachers are not able to have more than one specialization (Ludbrook, 2008). As a result, teachers may feel themselves required to engage in work that falls beyond their area of expertise. Unsurprisingly, there is much documentation of teachers' frustration and indeed disdain for the challenge of teaching a CLIL course.

Foran-Storer (2007) describes one study which indicates that pharmacy professors in Spain thought that 1) Spanish students would not be able to follow courses in foreign languages; 2) professors lacked sufficient foreign language ability; 3) it was not necessary, or even impossible, to teach pharmacy in another language. Similarly, Wozniak (2013) administered a questionnaire of 27 items related to difficulties in CLIL courses to pharmacy professors at a university in Spain, with items ranked on a scale of zero to 10. Five items received a score of 7.5 or above: assessing students' level of English; maintaining a quality of instruction similar to classes in Spanish; correcting students' utterances; giving linguistic feedback; and evaluating students' oral performances. Making CLIL successful entails teachers learning new ways of teaching, something which they may not feel inclined to or capable of doing.

In many cases teachers employ a lecture-based style of teaching that is not compatible with CLIL. Garotti (2009) conducted a survey of 100 students in a German-language CLIL course in Italy. She found that although the course consisted mainly of lectures, with little student interaction, the students did not find this problematic and commented that in any case they were not used to a more interactive style of learning. When problems in understanding took place, students were more likely to ascribe this to specific terminology rather than general proficiency in German. Nevertheless, Garotti notes that if a goal of CLIL is the ability to discuss the discipline in the foreign language, in this course this has not been attained (Garotti, 2009).

While CLIL is by no means limited to English, and EU guidelines call for proficiency in three languages ensuring that no one language will be the sole target of study, critics question whether English may not emerge as the dominant language. Ardeo (2013) warns of the possible “Anglicization” of curricula, noting, “The word internationalization primarily suggests, or should suggest, multiculturalism and multilingualism but a flow of cultures and languages other than English does not seem to exist.” (Ardeo, 2013, p.24). All EU languages are certainly possible languages of instruction. However, language selection may potentially be contentious.

Views and experiences of CLIL in Italian universities

As part of a larger research project investigating the development of teaching materials and methodology to effectively and efficiently implement specialized courses in English, particularly in the fields of advertising and marketing, the present researcher met with professors and administrators at five universities in Italy. The meetings lasted at least one hour. In some cases, more than one meeting took place. The contacts were identified through their research and other efforts to implement CLIL. The goal of the meetings was to learn more about the nuts and bolts of putting CLIL into operation at the university level. The universities were located in central and northern Italy, and had been founded as early as the 10th century to as recently as the late 20th century.

Objectives

All of the Italian universities investigated made plain on their websites and in discussions with those involved in CLIL their belief in the efficacy of English language instruction of specialized courses. These benefits fell into two types: 1) greater study and employment opportunities in the international sphere; and 2) raising the international profile of the university and attracting more foreign students and faculty.

The first objective focuses on the needs of the domestic students, while

the second centers on the international arena. While the objectives are not necessarily conflicting, the result is a CLIL classroom of faculty and students with differing demands and intentions, making the teaching of CLIL classes more complicated than a case in which the sole goal was to prepare domestic undergraduates to handle topics in their field of study in English or, conversely, preparing courses in English exclusively for international students already proficient in English, taught by foreign faculty members. The challenges of this linguistically mixed bag of professors and students were frequently raised by the informants, as discussed below.

CLIL designation

The universities had been contacted owing to their engagement with CLIL methodology, but the CLIL label was applied differently in the various universities. CLIL is firmly underway in secondary education in Italy, but rather than this facilitating the ushering in of CLIL in the tertiary level, these circumstances were sometimes perceived as working against university initiatives. An informant at one university noted that because the term CLIL was associated with secondary schools, there was hesitation in using it in the university system, and that there was a “need to tread carefully” in order not to put off professors and administrators who might view CLIL as beneath, or at least distinct from, university aims.

On the other hand, wide awareness of CLIL through the high school programs can also help promote universities’ pedagogical aims. A continuation and expansion of secondary-level CLIL may seem logical and compelling. Accordingly, two of the universities announced their CLIL programs on their websites clearly, with the assumption that the value of CLIL university courses would be recognized. As the term itself can be used to describe a wide variety of integrated content and language endeavors, an informant at another university used the term “weak CLIL” to define a language instruction-driven course that sought to additionally include meaningful content.

Implementation of CLIL

The informants stressed the importance of easing into CLIL. For example, one university offered a two-day English language and advertising seminar in March when classes were not in session. Any student from the School of Economics could participate and receive one credit if they fulfilled the course requirements: a pre-course assignment, eight hours of lectures, work at home, and a final test, for a total of 25 hours of work. The seminar garnered 25 participants. Several informants also suggested beginning teaching just one module of a course in English.

It is also possible to think of CLIL in terms of degrees. For example, while the same university mentioned above offers courses completely taught in the foreign language, more are partially taught in it, and even more courses are taught in Italian but with a reading list in English. Thus, the goal of increasing contact with the foreign language is implemented in a variety of ways.

Tandem teaching was frequently raised as one way to enhance CLIL, but it had not been fully implemented at any of the universities. Coordination between professors was difficult due to schedules and commitments. Nonetheless, there was a sense that the challenges posed by CLIL could not fully be solved without close cooperation between language and content professors.

Informants at all universities noted that there were more resources available to support professors making the transition to CLIL courses than for language support for students, despite acknowledging the difficulties some students may face in grappling difficult content for the first time in a foreign language. The informants stressed the need for on-demand help, either in the classroom or outside of it. One informant noted that he was trying to establish an English writing center at the university. Online scaffolding had also been made available at some of the universities.

Classroom experiences and assessment

In some ways, the challenges of CLIL at the tertiary level are less severe than they are at the secondary level, but in many respects they are more critical. CLIL is well underway in Europe in high schools, with officially mandated instruction for teachers. On the other hand, teacher training in CLIL is not required for university professors. Students have undergone much of the hard work of learning a foreign language before entering university, often entering at the B1 level or higher. At the same time, the content is naturally even more abstruse at the tertiary level, necessitating acquisition of specialized language, and poses even more difficult cognitive demands.

Three strands of issues emerged in the discussions with the CLIL informants: a) basic communication shortcomings of the professors; b) more advanced issues of methodology in teaching content to students in a language which was not their native tongue; and c) student assessment in CLIL classes.

a) Basic communication shortcomings of professors

Even in monolingual contexts, one issue in university classes is that professors are typically hired based on their research rather than on the dynamism of their classes. Nevertheless, many of the teachers at Italian universities teaching CLIL courses viewed their role as lecturers and were not open to exploring ways to make the content in the foreign language more easily comprehensible to students. All informants stressed that the principal concern in CLIL university classes was how to create intelligible, accessible content. The two most often-cited problems were difficult pronunciation and confusing slides (or a lack of sufficient visual support). These were perceived as greatly hindering student understanding, but also as areas which could be ameliorated through raising the awareness of the professors. Ways of coping with the challenges of teaching and learning in a foreign language included providing glossaries and sending materials to students beforehand. Professors were further encouraged to make effective use of gestures and emphatic intonation as well as to focus particular attention on the key words that must be correct.

b) More advanced teaching issues

More than one informant stressed the notion that professors mediate information. Students from different countries learn differently and therefore have to be taught differently. One informant noted wryly that at his university it was possible to have Italians teaching in English to German students. Such a language mix influences both expectations and outcomes. Another informant emphasized that it is better not to treat multilinguals as monolinguals. CLIL should not be applied in a mechanistic way that denies the linguistic realities of the teacher or students. Moreover, meaningful learning requires both a respect for the professor and an openness to ask for clarification as necessary. Unfortunately, the professor's lack of linguistic ability in the language of instruction at times hindered the development of a strong relationship with the students. Furthermore, a lack of English proficiency was interpreted as a lack of expertise by the students.

c) Student assessment

While the goal of CLIL is an advancement of both content mastery and linguistic proficiency, assessment in CLIL courses was primarily concerned with the degree to which students had mastered the content. Less emphasis was placed on assessing students' linguistic ability. In some cases, efforts were made to lighten the linguistic demands on the test-takers by offering multiple-choice questions. In assessing written work, language errors did not affect the students' grades.

Table 2 shows a list of the problems most commonly cited by the informants.

Table 2. Potential problems in CLIL courses

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pronunciation difficult to understand ➤ Power point slides confusing and/or overwhelming ➤ Courses taught in English receive unfavorable evaluations ➤ Students may not fully learn content or language ➤ No documentation of language proficiency of content professors ➤ Professors may be unaware of their shortcomings ➤ Students may not be able to express themselves clearly on exams ➤ Lack of collaboration between language teachers and content teachers |
|--|

Teacher training

While CLIL training has been underway at high schools in Italy for several years, the idea of training university professors is new. Some teachers are almost offended at the idea, according to one informant. Nonetheless, such training is slowly gaining traction. In the training, professors are introduced to teaching methodologies; unlike their secondary-level counterparts, no pedagogical training is required to become a professor. Training usually involved 8-10 hours, at a time when classes were not in session. Training encompassed the sharing of CLIL experiences, error analysis, and practice with feedback. One university's training session began by asking teachers to talk about what they had done in their CLIL courses, including what subjects they taught and their feelings about it. The most common type of training involves observation and feedback of professors, asking questions such as, "What's the error here?"

Teachers additionally often give mini-lectures as part of the training, which serve as the basis for self-reflection and as a means to raise awareness of the teaching process. In other cases, teachers watch videos of native and non-native teachers and compare how the teachers approach the material and communicate with the students. Participants are encouraged to ask themselves what might be useful for the students. Many informants mentioned the need to reassure teachers that they are not language teachers. In fact, one informant bluntly said, "Make it clear it is not a language course." At the same time, teachers were encouraged to realize that the use of a different language of instruction was an element that required acknowledgement. The informants noted that many professors feel a reluctance to be observed. However, while it is unusual to work together in this way, the training sessions often have a positive tension, and participants feel happy at the end.

Training was usually offered to different faculties, rather than to all faculties in one session, as the needs of each faculty were perceived as distinct. Those involved in implementing CLIL typically notified either the dean of a given faculty or directly contacted the content teachers who were currently

teaching CLIL classes or likely to in the future. At all the universities, teachers were encouraged to participate in training, but were not required to do so, although the faculty of one university was considering making it mandatory. In most cases, there were no more than a handful of participants at the first training sessions. One informant noted that he contacted 10 content teachers but only one replied.

Some courses were subsidized, in others the professors were required to pay for the course. Paying by themselves for the course could motivate teachers to actively participate. On the other hand, it might discourage others who balked at paying. The courses were not cheap. For example, the course at one university was 175 euros. One informant noted that adding extra advantages to the teacher training such as conference support or digital software other than power point often served as an impetus to participation. Table 3 lists the most common elements of the CLIL teacher training.

Table 3. Core matters in teacher training

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Emphasis on importance of signposting ➤ Mini-lectures as basis for self-reflection ➤ Observation and feedback of professors ➤ Asking lecturer what could be useful for students ➤ Instruction in class management phrases ➤ Pausing to allow students to decipher meaning ➤ Adding extra benefits to teacher training – ex, conference support ➤ Making message available for people with differentiated skills ➤ Investigating aspects of academic teaching
--

One informant emphasized that using an external expert, for example, affiliated faculty from other countries, as a contact served to enhance the image of the training, adding prestige. In addition to the training sessions, many of the universities were attempting to set up year-round support for teachers. Table 4 provides examples of teacher support arranged by the universities.

Table 4. Examples of CLIL teacher-training programs

- Eight lessons of 1 1/2 hours or nine lessons of two hours; help desk run by two PhD students
- Three lessons of three hours each
- British Council course on teaching professor's subject in English; support for professors at language center

Conclusion

As Japanese universities establish plans to greatly increase the number of courses taught in English with an aim of enhancing the linguistic proficiency of domestic students as well as facilitating the study of international students, the experiences of European universities over recent decades can serve as an important source of information regarding methods and issues. CLIL emerged in Europe as a means to realize the objective of students gaining knowledge of three EU languages. Additionally, CLIL seeks not only to teach content courses in a foreign language but also to enable students to actively engage in the discipline in question in the target language.

Accordingly, a CLIL course has dual objectives: ensuring that students master content equivalent to the content they would learn in a similar L1 course and at the same time going beyond passive knowledge of the L2 to an ability to use the language in a range of cognitive tasks related to the content. Through the dual content and linguistic objectives embedded in the courses it is hoped that students' linguistic proficiency will increase without adding courses to the curriculum. CLIL resembles other content-based instruction (CBI) approaches in the past. However, the language through content rather than content through language orientation is significant.

There are various models that endeavor to face the challenges of CLIL instruction, yet issues remain. These include the creation or modification of educational materials, use of the L1 and other non-target languages, and appropriate assessment. They further involve concerns related to the demands on the professors involved and the "Anglicization" of the curricu-

lum. Professors at the five Italian universities who discussed CLIL implementation primarily focused on the burden of non-native CLIL professors and initiatives to train the content-course professors in ways to make the content accessible as well as get beyond lecture-style teaching. A secondary concern was support for students in terms of scaffolding and writing centers. The professors stressed the need to begin CLIL courses in stages, for example, beginning with one module. Nonetheless, progress was gradual and often involved making professors conscious of the challenges of a CLIL course. Indeed, an awareness of the difficulties is the first step in successful implementation of CLIL courses in Japan as well. While more research needs to be conducted on the implementation of English-language content courses in the Japanese context, learning firsthand of the experiences of CLIL implementation in Italian universities provides a wealth of information useful for similar initiatives in Japan.

Acknowledgements: I would like express my deep gratitude to the professors in Italy who were kind enough to meet with me and discuss their experiences with CLIL.

References

- Ardeo, J. (2013). (In)compatibility of CLIL and ESP courses at university. *Language Value*, 5(1), 24-27.
- Banegas, D. (2014). An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks: issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(3), 345-359.
- Barbero, T. (2007). CLIL in scientific fields: from teaching language to learning activities. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang AG., 287-298.
- Bosisio, N. (2015). CLIL in the Italian university: a long but promising way to go. *ELLE* 4(1), 133-154.
- Brown, H. and Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in Language Education*. Tokyo: JALT, 328-334.

- Brown, H. (2017). Cooperation and collaboration in undergraduate EMI: Adapting EAP to the emergence of blended academic norms and practices in a Japanese university. In J. Valcke and R. Wilkinson (Eds.) *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 151-166.
- Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: the same or different?, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28:1, 8-24.
- Cinganotto, L. (2016). CLIL in Italy: a general overview. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 9(2), 374-400.
- Chung, T. (2015). Content and language integrated learning approach in designing an English course book for police investigators at the People's Police University in Vietnam. *KMUTT Journal of Language Education*, 20, 48-56.
- Coonan, C. (2003). Some issues in implementing CLIL. *European Language Council Information Bulletin* 9.
- Coonan, C. (2012). The foreign language curriculum and CLIL. *Synergies Italie*, 8, 117-128.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., and Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- European Commission (1995). *White paper on education and learning: teaching and learning, towards the learning society*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf
- European Commission (2014). *Improving the effectiveness of language learning: CLIL and computer assisted language learning*. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/>
- Foran-Storer, D. (2007). Teaching technical English at the tertiary and professional level: content-based cooperative learning under the CLIL umbrella. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt : Peter Lang AG, 309-317.
- Gallagher, F. and Colohan, G. (2014). T(w)o and fro: using the L1 as a language teaching tool in the CLIL classroom, *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-14.
- Garotti, F. (2009). Potential and problems of university CLIL. In F. Sisti (Ed.) *CLIL Methodology in University Instruction: Online and in the Classroom. An Emerging Framework*. Urbino: Guerra Edizioni, 215-222.
- Hofmannová, M., Novotná, J., and Pípalová, R. (2008). Assessment approaches to teaching mathematics in English as a foreign language (Czech experience). *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 20-35.
- Hondris, G, Vlahavas, I, and Demetriadis, S. (2007). Negotiation of meaning and digital textbooks in the CLIL Classroom. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang AG., 319-330.
- Kane, E. Tanaka, Y., and Kobayashi, A. (2014). Scaffolding content-driven teaching for language learners: implications for CLIL Courses at the University of Shimane. *Sogo Seisaku Rongyo*, Shimane University, 27, 126-149.

- Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Reflections on the use of the L1/L2 in English-medium instruction. In A. Linares and T. Morton (Eds.) *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 251-267.
- Leonardi, V. (2009). The impact of globalization on the Italian university teaching: CLIL implementation and teacher training. In F. Sisti (Ed.) *CLIL Methodology in University Instruction: Online and in the Classroom. An Emerging Framework*. Urbino: Guerra Edizioni, 189-196.
- Llinares, A., Morton, T., and Whittaker, R. (2012). *The Roles of Language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ludbrook, G. (2008). CLIL: The potential of multilingual education. *Dos Algarves*, 17, 18-27.
- MEXT (2012). *Higher education in Japan*. Tokyo, Japan: Higher Education Bureau, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan.
- Moore, P. and Nikula, T. (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL classrooms. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, and U. Smit (Eds.) *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 211-234.
- Moua, L. and Lindholm, A. (2007). Competence-building of teaching staff through autonomous and in-service education: the CLILCOM virtual learning environment. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt : Peter Lang AG., 333-342.
- Serragiotto, G. (2007). Assessment and evaluation in CLIL. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang AG., 271-282.
- Waseda University (2012). *Waseda Vision 150*. Retrieved from: www.waseda.jp/keiei/vision150/pdf/vision150_en.pdf
- Wolff, D. (2007). CLIL: bridging the gap between school and working life. In D. Marsh and D. Wolff. (Eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang AG., 15-25.
- Wozniak, M. (2013). CLIL in pharmacy: a case of collaboration between content and language lecturers. *Language Value* 5(1), 107-128.